

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2004:

I. PRIOR ART MATTERS

- A. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22 and 24 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Krakauer. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A single prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention only if it discloses each and every claim element.

The Office Action indicated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant herein cancels claims 4 and 5 and incorporates their limitations into claim 1.

As to amended claim 1, Krakauer does not disclose a vending machine comprising at least two slots, two helical feeder coils, and two motors, wherein one of the helical feeder coils rotates clockwise and the other helical feeder coil rotates counterclockwise.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 contain additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 1 and are also allowable.

Claims 4 and 5 stand cancelled.

The Office Action indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 19 has been cancelled and its elements and limitations incorporated into base claim 15.

Claim 15 is therefore allowable.

Claims 16 and 18 contain additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 15 and are also allowable.

The Office Action indicated that claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 22 and 23 have been cancelled and their elements and limitations incorporated into base claim 21.

Claim 21 is therefore allowable.

Claim 24 contains additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 21 and is also allowable.

- B. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 15, and 21 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sturrock. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 15, and 21 as amended are allowable for the reasons given above in regard to the previous rejections.

Claim 3 contains additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 1 and is also allowable.

- C. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 9, 15, 20, 21, and 26 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Wittern. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1, 15, and 21 as amended are allowable for the reasons given above in regard to the previous rejections.

Claim 9 contains additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 1 and is also allowable.


Claim 20 contains additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 15 and is also allowable.

Claim 26 contains additional elements or limitations beyond allowable claim 21 and is also allowable.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
 Gerald E. Helget (Reg. No. 30,948)
 Nelson R. Capes (Reg. No. 37,106)
 Briggs & Morgan P.A.
 80 South Eighth Street
 2200 IDS Center
 Minneapolis, MN 55402
 Telephone: (612) 977-8480